

REMARKS:

Claims 1-30 and 32-46 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1-30 and 32-46 stand rejected as obvious. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 11, 21, 27, 35, 36, 37, 41, 43, 45 and 46. Applicants have cancelled Claim 42 without prejudice.

Claims 1-30 and 32-41, and 43-46 are presented for examination.

Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview granted December 2, 2004. The Examiner agreed to provide an Interview Summary of the discussion.

Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 11, 21, 27, 35, 36, 37, 41, 45 and 46 to recite the invention more clearly. The amendments to these claims are supported at least by Applicants' specification at: page 9, lines 24-31; page 15, line 19 through page 16, line 18; page 20, lines 7-18; and page 22, line 20 through page 23, line 13. Accordingly, no new matter is introduced by these amendments.

Claim 43 is amended to provide dependency from Claim 41 in view of the cancellation of Claim 42.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bickmore

Claims 1-11, 15-20, 27, 28, 30, 34-36, 39, and 41-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over Bickmore et al. ("Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users", herein Bickmore).

In the Office Action, at page 3, the Examiner conceded that the system of Bickmore does not explicitly state a step of selecting the presentation scheme from a plurality of schemes. However, the Examiner maintained that Bickmore does describe

such a step in the Future work section (5) making it an obvious addition to the system and citing to Bickmore, section 5.1, p. 1 on page 543 (sic 545). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of each of the Claims.

Claims 1-10

Applicants' Claim 1, as amended, recites in part at least:

receiving a request from said user device for said data, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device;
identifying said presentation requirements of said user device based on said information present in said request; and
selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements wherein upon application of said presentation scheme to said data, new data presentable on said user device is generated.
(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that the references to Bickmore relied on by the Examiner at Section 5.1, fail to describe or suggest at least "selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device for application to said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements" as recited in part in Applicants' Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that references to Bickmore relied on by the Examiner at Section 5.1 describe at most giving users more control as to the selection of various transformation techniques that can be combined by the re-authoring engine of Digestor to arrive at a "good enough" version of a document. Particularly, Bickmore at section 5.1, p. 1, on page 545 recites:

5.1 More user control

Users should be able to adjust the various heuristics used in the planner to suit their taste.

For example, they could specify the relative preference of the transformation techniques, or specify that some transforms are not used. At a higher level of abstraction, they could express their preferences within a space of trade-offs, such as more content versus larger representation. In addition, the reauthoring system could be moved to the client and coupled with the browser so that the user could dynamically apply and undo different transformations until they achieved a result they liked. (emphasis added)

Further, Bickmore at page 539, section 3.3.2 describes:

In this section, we describe the re-authoring engine that uses heuristics to generate pages customized for the specific device upon which they will be displayed. Individual page transformations are ordered by their desirability. In order to determine which combination of transformations should be applied to a given document Digester performs a depth-first search of the document transformation space, using many heuristics that describe preconditions for transformations and combinations of transformations. The depth-first search ensures that a 'good enough' version of the document is found by using a combination of the most desirable transformations. Only if the more desirable transformations are not applicable or do not reduce the document enough are the less favored transformations used...As soon as a state is created containing a document version that is good enough, the search is halted and the document is returned to the client for rendering. (emphasis added)

Additionally, Bickmore at page 540, Section 3.3.3 describes:

Digester re-authors documents by first parsing them and constructing a parse tree or abstract syntax tree (AST) representation, applying a series of transformations to the tree and then mapping the tree back into a document representation (that may be in a document format that is different from the input format). The complexity lies in which subset of the many possible transformations should be applied.

Applicants submit that the transforms (that can be combined to generate different document version states) and the

different document version states resulting from various combinations of transforms as described in Bickmore are different from and fail to describe or suggest a presentation scheme as recited in Applicants' Claim 1. In particular, Applicants' specification at page 15, lines 19-23 describes a presentation scheme as:

...the totality of the configuration information needed to extract data from a first format and transform the data into new data for presentation on that user device.

Thus, Applicants submit the references to Bickmore relied on by the Examiner fail to describe or suggest at least "selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device for application to said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements" as recited in part in Applicants' Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the references to Bickmore relied on by the Examiner fail to describe or suggest at least "receiving a request from said user device for said data, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device" as recited in Applicants' Claim 1 (emphasis added).

In particular, Applicants submit that references relied on by the Examiner in Bickmore describe that users of the Digestor system input device information prior to obtaining a reauthored page (i.e., users preconfigure the Digestor system prior to obtaining a reauthored page).

In particular, Bickmore in the Overview, section 3.1, page 536 describes:

The first thing that users of Digestor will typically do is specify the size of display for their device and indicate the size of their default browser font; these are required in order to estimate the screen area requirements of the text blocks. Once

users have configured the system, they can start retrieving documents from the web. (emphasis added)

Distinguishably rather than requiring user input to preconfigure the system as in Bickmore, Applicants' Claim 1 recites in part at least "receiving a request from said user device for said data, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device" and "identifying said presentation requirements of said user device based on said information present in said request" (emphasis added).

Applicants' specification at page 23, lines 5-11 describes:

In retrieve scheme operation 270, portlet manager 113 uses the information extracted from the request to retrieve a presentation scheme for the user device from a plurality of presentation schemes 303 stored on storage unit 302. In one embodiment, the retrieved presentation scheme is loaded in a memory accessible by portlet manager 113. (emphasis added)

Thus, in accordance with Claim 1, information extracted from the request is used to identify presentation requirements of a user device and retrieve a presentation scheme specific to the user device in accordance with the presentation requirements.

Based on the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as amended, is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Bickmore.

Claims 2-10 depend from Claim 1 and so distinguish over Bickmore for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1-10.

Claims 11-20

Claim 11, as amended, recites at least "receiving a request from a user device generated by selection of a portlet identification object on said user device, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device", "analyzing said request to determine a user data format that is supported by said user device based on said information present in said request" and "selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device from a plurality of presentation schemes to convert said data from said source data format to said user data format" (emphasis added). For at least the same reasons given above for Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, Claim 11 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Bickmore.

Claims 12-20 depend from Claim 11 and so distinguish over Bickmore for at least the same reasons as Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 11-20.

Claims 21-26

Claim 21, as amended, recites at least "receiving a request from a user device generated by selection of a portlet identification object on the user device by a web server, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device", "analyzing said information present in said request to identify a user MIME type" and "selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device from a plurality of presentation schemes based upon said user MIME type and said source MIME type" (emphasis added). For at least the same reasons given above for Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, Claim 21 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Bickmore.

Claims 22-26 depend from Claim 21 and so distinguish over Bickmore for at least the same reasons as Claim 21.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 21-26.

Claims 27-34

Claim 27, as amended, recites at least "an identifying module for identifying presentation requirements of a user device from information included in a request" (emphasis added). For at least the same reasons given above for Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, Claim 27 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Bickmore.

Claims 28-34 depend from Claim 27 and so distinguish over Bickmore for at least the same reasons as Claim 27.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 27-34.

Claim 35

Claim 35, as amended, recites at least "receiving a request from a user device for data, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device", "identifying said presentation requirements of said user device based on said information present in said request" and "selecting a presentation scheme for said data specific to said user device from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements..." (emphasis added). For at least the same reasons given above for Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, Claim 35 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 35.

Claim 36

Claim 36, as amended, recites at least "receiving a request from a user device generated by selection of a portlet identification object on said user device, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device", "analyzing said information present in said request to determine a user data format that is supported by said user device" and "selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device from a plurality of presentation schemes..." (emphasis added). For at least the same reasons given above for Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, Claim 36 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 36.

Claim 37

Claim 37, as amended, recites at least "receiving a request from a user device generated by selection of a portlet identification object on the user device by a web server, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device", "analyzing said information present in said request to identify a user MIME type" and "selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device from a plurality of presentation schemes based upon said user MIME type and said source MIME type" (emphasis added). For at least the same reasons given above for Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, Claim 37 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 37.

Claim 41

Claim 41, as amended, recites at least "receiving a request from a user device to retrieve content associated with a portlet identifier, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device...", "identifying said presentation requirements of said user device based on said information present in said request," and "selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device from a plurality of presentation schemes for said content in accordance with said presentation requirements of said user device" (emphasis added). For at least the same reasons given above for Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, Claim 41 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Bickmore.

Claims 43 and 44 depend from Claim 41 and so distinguish over Bickmore for at least the same reasons as Claim 41.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 41, 43, and 44.

Claim 45

Claim 45, as amended, recites at least "identifying presentation requirements of said user device based on information included in at least one of said first request and said second request" and "selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements for said content" (emphasis added). For at least the same reasons given above for Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, Claim 45 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 45.

Claim 46

Claim 46, as amended, recites at least "receiving a request from said user device for said data, wherein said request includes at least a description of said data and information identifying presentation requirements of said user device", identifying said presentation requirements of said user device based on said information present in said request", and "selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device for said data from a plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements..." (emphasis added). For at least the same reasons given above for Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, Claim 46 is not obvious in view of and is patentable over Bickmore.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 46.

Rejection of Claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bickmore in view of Miller

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 27, Claim 29 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore. Assuming arguendo it is proper to combine Miller with Bickmore, Miller does not cure the previously described deficiencies of Bickmore.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Miller.

Claim 29 depends from Claim 27 and so distinguishes over Bickmore in view of Miller for at least the same reasons as Claim 27.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 29.

Rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bickmore in view of Deach et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 11, Claim 12 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore. Assuming arguendo it is proper to combine Deach with Bickmore, Deach does not cure the previously described deficiencies of Bickmore.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 11 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Deach.

Claim 12 depends from Claim 11 and so distinguishes over Bickmore in view of Deach for at least the same reasons as Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 12.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bickmore in view of Freed et al.

Claims 13, 14, 21, 23-26, 37, 38, and 40 were rejected as obvious and unpatentable over of Bickmore in view of Freed (RFC 2046 (sic, 2045), hereinafter Freed).

Claims 13 and 14

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 11, Claims 13 and 14 are not obvious and are patentable over Bickmore. Assuming arguendo it is proper to combine Freed with Bickmore, Freed does not cure the previously described deficiencies of Bickmore.

Thus, Applicants submit that Claim 11 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Freed.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 11 and so distinguish over Bickmore in view of Freed for at least the same reasons as Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 13 and 14.

Claims 21 and 23-26

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 21, Claims 21 and 23-26 are not obvious and are patentable over Bickmore. Assuming arguendo it is proper to combine Freed with Bickmore, Freed does not cure the previously described deficiencies of Bickmore.

Thus, Applicants submit that Claim 21 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Freed.

Claims 23-26 depend from Claim 21 and so distinguish over Bickmore in view of Freed for at least the same reasons as Claim 21.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 21 and 23-26.

Claims 37, 38 and 40

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 37, Claims 37, 38, and 40 are not obvious and are patentable over Bickmore. Assuming arguendo it is proper to combine Freed with Bickmore, Freed does not cure the previously described deficiencies of Bickmore.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 37 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Freed.

Claims 38 and 40 depend from Claim 37 and so distinguish over Bickmore in view of Freed for at least the same reasons as Claim 37.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 37, 38 and 40.

Rejection of Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bickmore in view of Freed and in further view of Deach.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 21, Claim 22 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore. Assuming arguendo it is proper to combine Freed and Deach with Bickmore, Freed and Deach do not cure the previously described deficiencies of Bickmore.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 21 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Freed and in further view of Deach.

Claim 22 depends from Claim 21 and so distinguishes over Bickmore in view of Freed and in further view of Deach for at least the same reasons as Claim 21.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 22.

Rejection of Claims 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bickmore in view of Jones.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the same reasons earlier presented with regard to the rejection of Claim 27, Claims 32 and 33 are not obvious and are patentable over Bickmore. Assuming arguendo it is proper to combine Jones with Bickmore, Jones does not cure the previously described deficiencies of Bickmore.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 is not obvious and is patentable over Bickmore in view of Jones.

Claims 32 and 33 depend from Claim 27 and so distinguish over Bickmore in view of Jones for at least the same reasons as Claim 27.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 32 and 33.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any

Appl. No. 09/759,744
Amdt. dated December 8, 2004
Response to Office Action of September 8, 2004

questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicants.


CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on December 8, 2004.


Attorney for Applicants

December 8, 2004
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,


Lisa A. Norris
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,976
Tel.: (831) 655-0880